



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,526	04/20/2001	Dietrich Charisius	7399-015	2147
4678	7590	05/12/2008	EXAMINER	
MACCORD MASON PLLC			WOOD, WILLIAM H	
300 N. GREENE STREET, SUITE 1600				
P. O. BOX 2974			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GREENSBORO, NC 27402			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/839,526	CHARISIUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William H. Wood	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4, 7-28, 31-65, 68-89 and 92-136 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 7-28, 31-65, 68-89 and 92-136 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-4, 7-28, 31-65, 68-89, 92-136 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-15, 17-32, 34-76, 78- 93 and 95-136 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Walton** et al. (USPN 5,883,639).

Claim 1

Walton disclosed a method in a data processing system, comprising the steps of:

providing a software development tool having a user interface that is operable by a user to automatically reflect a modification in the source code to avoid completely regenerating the source code (*figure 1 and 17*), wherein the software development tool includes computer instructions for performing the following computer-executable (*column 8, lines 44-65, “The interface designer*

next creates and/or modifies the graphical objects in the drawing and behavior editor 110 as desired using the available functions of the graphics editor of the designer's computer system. The resulting objects are then stored as objects in an object-oriented database system and connected to other objects or user code 120 in accordance with techniques commonly used in object-oriented systems.") steps:

receiving an identification of a data structure with an attribute field in a database of data structures useable to form an object-oriented element from the data structure (*figure 1, elements 100 and 110, selected components are data structures with attributes in a database, 100; column 8, lines 44-65, object-oriented code development*);

determining whether the data structure is associated with source code (*figure 1, elements 120 and 130, source code developed base on object components*);

when it is determined that the data structure is associated with source code, determining whether the attribute, field of the data structure is associated with an attribute in the source code (*figure 1, elements 120 and 130, source code developed base on object components; column 8, lines 58-62*); and

when it is determined that the attribute field is not associated with an attribute in the source code, generating a new attribute in the source code from the attribute field (*figure 1, elements 120 and 130, source code developed base on object components*); and

receiving user input to modify the source code (*figure 1, elements 120 and 130, source code developed base on object components; column 8, lines 44-65, “The interface designer next creates and/or modifies the graphical objects in the drawing and behavior editor 110 as desired using the available functions of the graphics editor of the designer’s computer system. The resulting objects are then stored as objects in an object-oriented database system and connected to other objects or user code 120 in accordance with techniques commonly used in object-oriented systems.”*)

modifying and displaying a graphical representation of the source code to reflect the source code modification (*column 9, lines 12-17; column 8, lines 51-62; thus the user manipulating the graphical objects alters the code which is “graphically represented” through the graphical objects*).

Claim 2

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of: when it is determined that the data structure is not associated with source code, retrieving a portion of the data structure; and generating the source code from the portion of the data structure (*column 8, lines 54-62; figure 1, elements 120 and 130; producing code from library/database of components*).

Claim 3

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

when it is determined that the data structure is associated with source code, determining whether a second attribute in the source code is associated with a second attribute field in the data structure (*figure 1, multiple components; figure 17*); and

when it is determined that a second attribute in the source code is not associated with a second attribute field in the data structure, removing the second attribute from the source code (*column 9, lines 13-15, “delete” components and thus code*).

Claim 4

Walton disclosed the method of claim 3, wherein the step of removing the second attribute from the source code comprises the step of removing a method associated with the second attribute from the source code (*column 9, lines 13-15, “delete” components and thus code, including associated methods*).

Claim 5

Walton disclosed the method of claim 3, further comprising the step of displaying a graphical representation of the source code (*figure 1, elements 110, 120 and 130*).

Claim 6

Walton disclosed the method of claim 5, further comprising the step of modifying the graphical representation of the source code to reflect the generation of the new attribute (*column 9, lines 13-15, “create” components and thus code*).

Claim 7

Walton disclosed the method of claim 5, further comprising the step of modifying the graphical representation of the source code to reflect the removal of the second attribute (*column 9, lines 13-15, “delete” components and thus code*).

Claim 8

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the data structure is associated with the source code comprises the step of searching a comment in the source code for the identification of the data structure (*figure 2, note comments*).

Claim 9

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the data structure is associated with the source code comprises the

step of comparing a name for the source code with the identification of the data structure (*figure 2, note comments*).

Claim 10

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of: retrieving access information for the database; and retrieving a portion of the data structure from the database using the access information (*figure 1, element 100 and 130*).

Claim 11

Walton disclosed the method of claim 10, wherein the step of retrieving the access information comprises the step of retrieving the identification of the data structure and the access information from a configuration file (*figure 1, element 100 and 130*).

Claim 12

Walton disclosed the method of claim 10, wherein the step of retrieving the access information comprises the step of retrieving the identification of the data structure and the access information from a comment of the source code (*figure 1, “include” statement also performs a commenting function*).

Claim 13

Walton disclosed the method of claim 10, wherein the portion of the data structure comprises the attribute field of the data structure (*figure 1, elements 100 and 110, selecting and manipulating components*).

Claim 14

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the source code comprises a class (*column 8, lines 54-56*).

Claim 15

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the source code comprises a distributed computing component (*column 8, lines 54-56; distributed as far as from a database*).

Claim 17

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the step of generating the new attribute in the source code comprises the step of generating a method in the source code to access the attribute field of the data structure (*column 8, lines 54-56, “connected to other objects”*).

Claims 18-32, 34-76, 78- 93 and 95-136

The limitations of claims 18-76 and 78-136 correspond to the limitations found in method claims 1-17 and are rejected in the same manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 16, 33, 77 and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walton** et al. (USPN 5,883,639).

Claims 16, 33, 77 and 94

Walton did not explicitly state the method of claim 15, wherein the distributed computing component is an Enterprise JavaBean.TM. Official Notice is taken that it was known at the time of invention to make use of JavaBean components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the components of **Walton** with including Enterprise JavaBean components. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make

use of all components on the market in-order to reach the largest available clientele.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11 March 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues **Walton** fails to disclose "computer-executable" steps as indicated by Applicant's claim language.

Use of the phrase "computer-executable" does not limit the claim language to steps that do not include a user. Regardless of whether a user is involved or not, the disclosed steps of **Walton** are "computer-executable" as they are clearly performed using computer. **Walton** executes the steps within a computer.

Additionally, this reading of the claim language is consistent with Applicant's claims and disclosure. For instance, claim 1 recites "software development tool having a user interface" (clearly a user is involved in the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims). Reviewing the originally filed disclosure, no evidence has been found that a user cannot be involved in process.

The rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2193

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 10:00am - 4:00pm Tuesday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis A. Bullock Jr. can be reached on (571)-272-3759. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained form either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR systems, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. For questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

/William H. Wood/
William H. Wood
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193
May 10, 2008